

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated July 22, 2009, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the explanation found on page 2 of the Office Action.

As indicated above, claims 1 and 9-11 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claims. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claim 1 claims an information processing apparatus, claim 9 claims a method, claim 10 claims a program and claim 11 claims a computer-readable record medium. The apparatus, method, program and medium include (a) generating management information that associates a first identifier with information about the data and (b) generating a second identifier that can identify reproduction history of the data in a storage area of the record medium.

By generating a second identifier that can identify reproduction history of data in a storage area of a record medium, as claimed in claims 1 and 9-11, the claimed invention provides an apparatus, method, program and medium which can improve the convenience of the record medium so that a reproduction process can be more easily performed. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 9-11.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by *David, et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0131764).

David, et al. appears to disclose a recorder including a first generator for generating first material identifiers for identifying respective pieces of material on the medium such that each piece is differentiated from other pieces on the medium, and a second generator for generating second, universally unique, identifiers for pieces of material, the second identifiers being

generated in respect of one or more of the first identifiers [0010]. The first identifiers, which need to distinguish the pieces of material on the medium, but need not be universally unique, and thus be smaller than universally unique identifiers [0012]. A camcorder 500 records video and audio material on a recording medium. A database processor 176 stores metadata which relates to the material recorded on the tape 126 [0090]. The metadata is linked to the material by UMIDs and by at least MURNs. The MURNs are intended to uniquely identify each piece of material on the tape [0091]. MURNs are generated as the material is recorded on the tape [0093].

Thus, *David, et al.* merely discloses generating material identifiers for identifying respective pieces of material on the medium. Nothing in *David, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests an identifier that can identify reproduction history of the data of the record medium as claimed in claims 1 and 9-11. Rather, *David, et al.* only discloses that the first generator generates first material identifiers identifying respective pieces of material on the medium such that each piece is differentiated from other pieces.

Since nothing in *David, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests generating a second identifier that can identify reproduction history of the data of the record medium as claimed in claims 1 and 9-11, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8 would not have been anticipated by *David, et al.* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for a reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner find that the application is not now in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner enters this Amendment for purposes of appeal.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: September 22, 2009

By: 

Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
Tel. (202) 292-1530